

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FISH AND GAME COMMISSION  
INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR REGULATORY ACTION  
(Pre-publication of Notice Statement)

Amend Section 265  
Title 14, California Code of Regulations  
Re: Use Of Dogs for Pursuit/Take of Mammals or for Dog Training

I. Date of Statement: January 14, 2002

II. Dates and Locations of Scheduled Hearings:

- |     |                     |           |                        |
|-----|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|
| (a) | Notice Hearing:     | Date:     | February 9, 2002       |
|     |                     | Location: | Sacramento, California |
| (b) | Discussion Hearing: | Date:     | March 8, 2002          |
|     |                     | Location: | San Diego, California  |
| (c) | Discussion Hearing: | Date:     | April 5, 2002          |
|     |                     | Location: | Long Beach, California |
| (d) | Adoption Hearing:   | Date:     | April 25, 2002         |
|     |                     | Location: | Sacramento, California |

III. Description of Regulatory Action:

- (a) Statement of Specific Purpose of Regulation Change and Factual Basis for Determining that Regulation Change is Reasonably Necessary:

Current regulations erroneously describes the line forming the boundary of the Southern Sierra dog control zone. There are road junctions and intersections described which do not exist, and unintentional "gaps" in the line exist because connecting roads are not written into the description. Hence, it is impossible to follow the boundary line, either on a map or on the ground. The proposed change rectifies the error by correctly naming roads in boundary descriptions.

- (b) Authority and Reference Sections from Fish and Game Code for Regulation:

Authority cited: Sections 200, 202 and 203, Fish and Game Code.

Reference: Sections 200, 202, 203, 203.1, 207 and 4756, Fish and Game Code.

- (c) Specific Technology or Equipment Required by Regulatory Change:  
None.

- (d) Identification of Reports or Documents Supporting Regulation Change:  
  
Draft Environmental Document Regarding Bear Hunting.

- (e) Public Discussions of Proposed Regulations Prior to Notice Publication:

Although the proposed changes are relatively simple and few, the Department held four public meetings regarding the proposed changes as follows:

November 7, 2001 in Fresno  
November 13, 2001 in San Diego  
November 29, 2001 in Monterey  
December 13, 2001 in Sacramento

#### IV. Description of Reasonable Alternatives to Regulatory Action:

- (a) Alternatives to Regulation Change:

No alternative to the proposed change is identified.

- (b) No Change Alternative:

This alternative would continue to provide wrong descriptions for boundaries of the dog control zones. This alternative is rejected because it would continue confusion for the public.

- (c) Consideration of Alternatives:

In view of information currently possessed, no reasonable alternative considered would be more effective in carrying out the purposes for which the regulation is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to the affected private persons than the proposed regulation.

The statement described pursuant to Section 11346.14(b), Government Code, may be modified by information received at public meetings scheduled for March 8, 2002, in San Diego, California, and April 5, 2002, in Long Beach, California.

V. Mitigation Measures Required by Regulatory Action:

Attached are copies of the Draft Environmental Document Regarding Bear Hunting.

VI. Impact of Regulatory Action:

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made.

- (a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Businesses, Including the Ability of California Businessmen to Compete with Businesses in other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. Because the proposed change clarifies the regulation, it is economically neutral.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California: None.

- (c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The agency is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State: None.

- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies: None.

- (f) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts: None.

- (g) Costs Imposed on Any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4: None.

- (h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.



## INFORMATIVE DIGEST (Plain English Overview)

Current regulations erroneously describe the line forming the boundary of the Southern Sierra dog control zone. The proposed change rectifies the error by correctly naming roads in boundary descriptions.